





**ANOTHER OVER-ISSUE FRAUD.**—It appears that Edward Crane, President of the Vermont Central Railroad, was one of the subscribers to the stock of the Sunbury and Erie Railroad, Pennsylvania, and upon the faith of which the city of Philadelphia issued bonds for the first million of subscription, the ordinance authorizing the subscription required that a similar amount should first be obtained from private subscribers. The discovery of this fraud, it is said, will suspend operations upon the road, as the second subscription by the city cannot now be paid.

## CONGRESS.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

Senate, Tuesday, July 18, 1854.

The Homestead bill was again taken up. Mr. Stark introduced his proposed substitute.

Mr. Wells addressed the Senate in favor of giving to actual settlers a portion of the public lands.

He also discussed know-notings and the like, and, in doing so, denounced them both as unjust.

Mr. Benjamin followed in opposition to the bill.

*House of Representatives.*, July 18, 1854.

The bill regulating postage was taken up. Mr. Olds said he did not see the gentlemen from Virginia (Mr. McMullen) in his seat; and as he had nothing further to say on the subject of this bill, he would demand the previous question.

The bill to provide for the payment of such sums as may be necessary for the defense of Texas as are comprehended in the act of Congress of October 9, 1850, being under consideration, Mr. Chase moved to reduce the amount to be apportioned among the holders of bonds to the sum of \$6,000,000.

The bill was voted down in the negative.

The question was then taken on ordering the bill to be engrossed, and it was decided in the affirmative, as follows:

Yea—Allen, Atwood, Badger, Bell, Bright, Brothman, Cooper, Dawson, Dixen, Evans, Fish, Font, Houston, James, John, Jones, Jones, Mallory, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Rockwell, Russ, Sebastian, Steward, Thompson, Kennedy, and Tonney—12.

Nay—McMullen, Allen, Bingham, Bitter, Chase, Dodge, Iowa, Douglas, Fessenden, Geyer, Gillette, Hunter, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Shields, Slidell, Summer, Thompson of New Jersey, Tomson, Wade, Walker, and Weld—13.

The bill was then read a third time, and passed.

The resolution for printing ten thousand copies of the Nebraska bill in its authentic form was amended so as to make twenty thousand in pamphlet form, and in that shape passed.

Mr. Chase moved to amend the bill to consider the same with a view that he might have it referred to allow certain amendments, and the vote thereon, embodied in the same pamphlet. The vote stood—yea 16, nays 6.

So the Senate referred to consider the vote.

*House of Representatives*, July 21, 1854.

Mr. Bayly, of Virginia, arose to a privileged position, as committee had been sent to the Oil Investigation Committee on our Benj. E. Green, changing Green's name from corruption and fraud, while chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, in receiving pecuniary advantages from Mr. Corcoran, the receiver of the money, and the same to Mexico, from our Government, to be made through the bankings of that gentleman.

There appeared to be a general disposition of the House to pay no attention to the subject, but Mr. H. H. Donisthorpe, after consulting with the committee, moved for a railroad in that State, had been mutilated and altered in an important manner, subsequent to the time of its being ordered to be enrolled.

Mr. Wadsworth, of Massachusetts, also opposed the bill. He regarded it as one of the most mischievous bills of the session, and adopted to vote in opposition to the bill, and the progress of the country. Nothing but the strongest necessity, he said, should induce an increase of postage on papers and books. And that the idea that the Post Office Department should be allowed to do more than any other Department should be self-evident.

Mr. Eliot, of Massachusetts, also opposed the bill. He regarded it as one of the most mischievous bills of the session, and adopted to vote in opposition to the bill, and the progress of the country. Nothing but the strongest necessity, he said, should induce an increase of postage on papers and books. And that the idea that the Post Office Department should be allowed to do more than any other Department should be self-evident.

Mr. Eliot spoke at great length, and entered into an elaborate examination of the subject.

*Senate*, Wednesday, July 19, 1854.

Mr. Sumner presented the memorial of Charles Francis Adams, and three hundred other citizens of all parts of Quincy, Mass., etc., praying the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law.

Mr. Chase presented similar petitions from citizens of Ohio.

Mr. Pettit, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom had been referred numerous memorials praying the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, reported that the same were duly considered, and the committee were of opinion that any such legislation was inexpedient, and that the bill should not be more tractable than that any other Department should be self-evident.

Mr. Eliot spoke at great length, and entered into an elaborate examination of the subject.

*Senate*, Wednesday, July 19, 1854.

Mr. Sumner presented the memorial of Charles Francis Adams, and three hundred other citizens of all parts of Quincy, Mass., etc., praying the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law.

Mr. Chase presented the Diplomatic Appropriation Bill, was taken up, and the numerous amendments proposed by the Committee on Finance were considered.

*House of Representatives*, July 22, 1854.

Mr. May, by consent, made a report from the Committee on the District, adverse to the requests of certain memorials in the State of New York, which relate that the State has no right to prohibit the importation of slaves into its ports; and that with a view to permanent arrangements, the President is authorized to procure, by purchase or otherwise, suitable sites for the adaptation of the uses of the coast.

Mr. Stanton urged the necessity of immediate action on this measure.

The amendments proposed by the Committee were adopted, and the bill was passed.

Mr. Olds called for the regular order of business, and moved to adjourn the session on the 28th day of July.

Mr. Dickinson moved to lay the bill upon the table.

This motion was decided in the affirmative—yeas 74, nays 67.

*Senate*, Thursday, July 20, 1854.

After a long discussion upon the Homestead bill, Mr. Hunter moved a substitute for it. This substitute proposes to graduate the prices of the lands from twenty-five cents to one dollar, according to the time the same may have been in market; leaving the State to decide in each place; and that with a view to permanent arrangements, the President is authorized to procure, by purchase or otherwise, suitable sites for the adaptation of the uses of the coast.

Mr. Stanton urged the necessity of immediate action on this measure.

The amendments proposed by the Committee were adopted, and the bill was passed.

Mr. Olds called for the regular order of business, and moved to adjourn the session on the 28th day of July.

Mr. Dickinson moved to lay the bill upon the table.

This motion was decided in the affirmative—yeas 74, nays 67.

*Senate*, Thursday, July 20, 1854.

Mr. Olds, from the Post Office Committee, reported the usual bill establishing post routes.

The House resolved itself into Committees of the Whole on the state of the Union, and resolved to consider of the Army Appropriation bill, (Mr. Wright, of Pennsylvania, in the chair.)

The debate in Committee related to the proposed sale of the city of St. Louis, for the purpose of a park, of the United States property upon which the arsenal now sits, of which it is located.

Mr. McMullen opposed the proposition, on the ground that the property was worth more than \$100,000.

Mr. Bishop Parkins said he did not care to demand the whose parting for the value of the land. The city of St. Louis contains one hundred thousand inhabitants. In half a century it would exceed two millions. It is a glorious thing to add a park in its limits. Public lands were disposed of for less worthy purposes, without strict reference to the price received.

In reply to a question, Mr. Perkins said that

if he knew the land to be worth half a million, he would be willing to give it to the city of St. Louis for the park.

The amendment proposed by Mr. Benton, granting the land to St. Louis for a quarter of a million, was substituted, on motion of Mr. Benton, for the original, directing the sale of the land at an auction, which was finally agreed to by the Committee, and ordered to be reported to the House.

The bill was finally reported to the House, and passed—yeas 93, nays 63.

*Senate*, Friday, July 21, 1854.

Mr. Chase presented several petitions praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

The Homestead bill, as amended last night by the adoption of the substitute moved by Mr. Hunter, was taken up on its third reading.

The bill was read a third time, and passed—yeas 36, nays 11.

The bill in the Senate, as amended, was voted down in the negative.

The question was then taken on ordering the bill to be engrossed, and it was decided in the affirmative, as follows:

Yea—Allen, Atwood, Badger, Bell, Bright, Brothman, Cooper, Dawson, Dixen, Evans, Fish, Font, Houston, James, John, Jones, Jones, Mallory, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Rockwell, Russ, Sebastian, Steward, Thompson, Kennedy, and Tonney—12.

Nay—McMullen, Allen, Bingham, Bitter, Chase, Dodge, Iowa, Douglas, Fessenden, Geyer, Gillette, Hunter, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Shields, Slidell, Summer, Thompson of New Jersey, Tomson, Wade, Walker, and Weld—13.

The bill was then read a third time, and passed.

The resolution for printing ten thousand copies of the Nebraska bill in its authentic form was amended so as to make twenty thousand in pamphlet form, and in that shape passed.

Mr. Chase moved to amend the bill to consider the same with a view that he might have it referred to allow certain amendments, and the vote thereon, embodied in the same pamphlet. The vote stood—yea 16, nays 6.

So the Senate referred to consider the vote.

*House of Representatives*, July 24, 1854.

Mr. Davis, of Indiana, by consent, reported from the Committee on the District, a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Campbell moved to amend the bill to consider the same with a view that he might have it referred to allow certain amendments, and the vote thereon, embodied in the same pamphlet. The vote stood—yea 16, nays 6.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported it to the House; that it had been found, upon inquiry, that the bill had not come into the possession of the House, and that it had not been introduced, after consultation with the Clerk of the House had directed the Engrossing Clerk to render it as it now stands upon the record.

Mr. Solers said the bill had been referred to him in the consideration of a committee, and he thought that committee should proceed with the performance of its duties.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was agreed to, and the resolution was adopted.

At a subsequent period in to-day's session, Mr. Stevens of Michigan, availed of a personal explanation, and in the course of his speech, introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, in conformity with the copy of the bill as he had reported

